



Approved January 25, 2006

**PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE
CITY HALL KIVA
3939 NORTH DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA
JANUARY 11, 2006**

STUDY SESSION MINUTES

PRESENT: David Gulino, Chairman (arrived 4:20)
Steve Steinberg, Vice-Chairman
James Heitel, Commissioner (arrived 4:20)
Eric Hess, Commissioner (arrived 4:10)
Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner
Steven Steinke, Commissioner
David Barnett, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT: Tim Curtis
Lusia Galav
Kira Wauwie
Greg Williams
Frank Gray
Donna Bronski

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The study session of the Scottsdale Planning Commission was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

2. **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT - LUSIA GALAV**

Ms. Galav reported on fencing issues per a conversation with Mike Clack from the Building Department. It was indicated that the City has no aesthetic requirements concerning vacant land or vacant structures. Most fencing is done at the owner's discretion, usually for security reasons. The City does require a solid type of fencing if operating close to the right-of-way or if there is a demo. She reported that the City may also require fencing of abandoned buildings for health and safety reasons. Ms. Galav also noted that code enforcement could be used to deal with unsightly issues.

APPROVED

Ms. Galav's suggested approach for addressing the aesthetic issues of temporary fencing included use of public art on solid fences, required screening, and requiring a certain color for screening. After consulting with Randy Grant, Ms. Galav recommended that the Planning Commission get the direction and recommendation of the Development Review Board. She suggested that the Commission could then impose certain types of temporary fencing requirements when issuing permits.

Commissioner Barnett noted that in addition to a more attractive solution, the definition of temporary needs to be clarified. He opined that a criteria needs to be set in order to prevent temporary fencing from being in place for two to three years at a time.

A discussion ensued concerning the problem of businesses that are not ready to redevelop. Commissioner Barnett noted zoning regulations on fencing in opposition to what is being done with temporary fencing being used along property lines and that empty lots do not need fencing. He also opined that the issue would fall under the Planning Commission's jurisdiction, because, while the aesthetics is Development Review; design, right-of-way, site locations, regulating rebuilds, temporary signs, and temporary definitions are the purview of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Galav suggested that permitting be consulted for allowed time frames on temporary signs and that code requirements for signs with permits be enforced.

Commissioner Barnett opined that there should be a permitting method to deal with temporary fencing as well as temporary signs whether simultaneously or separately. He also noted that with a campaign season beginning, many temporary signs will be going up.

Commissioner Schwartz inquired whether the temporary fencing and temporary sign issue is something that is allowed to be addressed on a policy level or if an ordinance change giving a clear definition of allowable length of time, materials, and other restrictions could be issued. He concurred with Commissioner Barnett that these areas should appear nice from the street.

Commissioner Barnett suggested that because Carmel, California has restrictive zoning ordinances and attractive temporary fencing their policies be paralleled concerning this issue.

3. **PRESENTATION ON THE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN AND BIKE PROGRAM BY REED KEMPTON & TERESA HUISH**

Ms. Huish began her presentation by requesting an audience with the Commission in future months in order to present updates on the Master Plan study, such as different modes of transportation, area studies, and the high capacity transit study. She included an overview of their consultation efforts including HDR Engineering, other jurisdictions, school districts, and the general public. She explained that the Master Plan would build on the specifics and implementation of the goals and policies of the Community Mobility Element.

Ms. Huish noted that the long term Master Plan will address key issues, integrate land use, be comprehensive and context sensitive to areas of the community, and will include modes such as streets, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and a safety overview. She included an overview of the Phase I approval in 2003, noting that Phase II will identify the technologies and how they will integrate into the regional system.

Highlights of Ms. Huish's presentation included the goals and objectives, modal plans, plans for area circulation studies, the public engagement plan, and timeline.

Reed Kempton addressed the Commission concerning the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan. He noted that the bike lanes, routes, paths, bridges, and tunnels are under control of the Transportation Department and that unpaved trails are governed by Preservation. Highlights of his presentation included an overview of bicycle parking and bike lane requirements accompanied by photographs depicting existing parking areas, bike lanes, and paths.

Mr. Kempton discussed the various existing bike routes and paths and the plans for expansion including the Indian Bend Wash and Pima Path. He presented a map noting that there are approximately 81 miles of routes, 56 paths, 268 miles of unpaved trails, and 58 grade separator crossings.

Mr. Kempton reported that there are 36 current projects concerning bikes currently underway, and that the project connecting McDowell and Thomas would be starting in the summer. He presented photographs of the approaches to the bridge including the connecting tunnel and projected bike path improvements.

In the course of the presentation, he noted that the League of American Bicyclists recognized Scottsdale as a bicycle friendly community at the silver level. Mr. Kempton indicated that he hopes to make a list of projects into the next 20 to 25 years, opining the need to have a prioritization plan to rank projects.

Commissioner Steinberg noted that the three ingredients that make a community bicycle friendly are safety, convenience and comfort ability. He opined that it is dangerous riding bicycles in Scottsdale.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Steinberg, Mr. Kempton cited that separations between an automobile and a biking lane tend to be obstacles and traps for cyclists.

Commissioner Barnett asked if there was prioritization between commuter bikers and leisure bikers, and suggested working outwards from employment hubs to create areas for commuters to use. Mr. Kempton replied that the bike projects are being piggybacked on existing road projects, and elaborated using examples of road projects in which bike lanes are being added.

Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager, remarked that Commissioner Barnett has provided good input and that prioritization should be part of the master plan. She reiterated the fact that bike lanes are being added whenever

possible on new projects. She agrees that how facilities are prioritized based on use is something that needs to be researched.

Commissioner Barnett remarked that the lanes around the Airpark are too narrow and too dangerous. He also inquired about incorporating shower facility requirements into master plan projects and larger projects.

Ms. O'Connor noted a TDM stipulation that is being included in projects such as the ASU Scottsdale Center for Technology and Innovation requiring that alternate transportation modes be encouraged and that showers and lockers be added to encourage cycling.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Barnett, Mr. Kempton confirmed that a push for education regarding traffic laws and cyclists will be a major component of the bike plan update.

Commissioner Schwartz concurred with Commissioner Barnett that different types of cyclists need to be distinguished. He also commented that there needs to be planning for gaps in bike lanes in areas where there will be no road projects.

Mr. Kempton agreed, noting that the Maricopa Association of Governments is updating their bicycle plan and that identifying and solving the gaps is their primary goal.

Chairman Gulino opined that imposing requirements for shower facilities would be overstepping the bounds of the Commission, and argued that an incentive program would be much more appropriate.

In response to inquiry by Chairman Gulino, Ms. Huish clarified that the trails would not be updated in the Master Plan because they are under the jurisdiction of the Preservation Division; however, trails will be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Gulino commented on the importance of giving a clear message concerning how the Master Plan is to be implemented; whether the plans are definitive or conceptual.

4. **DISCUSSION ON AMENDING POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Mr. Gray reiterated the instructions of the City Council that each board and commission review the codes concerning their powers and duties in order to make sure that their duties are defined properly and that they note any points that need to be amended. He also gave a brief overview of the powers and duties for the Planning Commission as it is written in the code.

It was agreed that Mr. Gray would send the information in a memo to each individual Commission Member and will take individual comments back to the City Council.

In response to Commissioner Schwartz's inquiry, Mr. Gray defined Municipal Master Plans as any kind of master plan that looks at the infrastructure of a city.

Commissioner Schwartz questioned whether the Planning Commission would be allowed to initiate plans to be forwarded to another Board or Commission, to which Mr. Gray responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Gray clarified for Commissioner Heitel that the Planning Commission determines the criteria and requirements for land division and zoning, and the DRB is the implementation body. Commissioner Heitel commented that many times the criteria and zoning are not properly reviewed. He opined that the Planning Commission Members are more qualified to review those matters.

5. **REVIEW OF JANUARY 11, 2006 AGENDA**

EXPEDITED AGENDA

15-AB-2004 (Biel Property)

Commissioner Heitel requested clarification and recommendation on public record by staff concerning a moratorium on abandonments.

Mr. Gray summarized that each case would be reviewed on its own merits and that requests for abandonments will not be recommended by Staff without knowledge of the infrastructure for the area.

Commissioner Heitel expressed an interest in discussing the subject further during the regular session.

23-UP-2005 (APS Cricket Hayden)

Commissioner Heitel requested that Staff clarify on public record that there are no other available locations outside of the Preserve in which to locate.

Commissioner Steinke requested that Mr. Curtis bring to the regular meeting the status information on the permit for the existing antenna.

19-ZN-2005 (Sierra Highlands)

Request by Commissioner Heitel to move Sierra Highlands to the regular agenda was granted.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. **39-ZN-1992#4 (Mayo Clinic)**

Request by Commissioner Steinberg to move to expedited agenda was granted.

Commissioner Barnett noted a conflict.

6. 4-TA-2004 (Parking Program Text Amendment)

Request by Commissioner Schwartz to move to expedited agenda was granted.

REVIEW OF JANUARY 25, 2006 TENTATIVE AGENDA

Ms. Galav reviewed tentative agenda for January 25, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Schwartz requested that projects with similar names be identified by including the name of the developer next to the project name.

With no further business to discuss, the study session adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc.